

MARYLAND RARE

JK

1849

1896

1840

T. LETTER

FROM

EDWARD A. LYNCH, Esq.

WHIG CANDIDATE FOR THE LEGISLATURE OF MARYLAND,

TO

JACOB BAER, THOS. SPRINGER, AND OTHERS.

MIDDLETOWN, June 19, 1840.

Edward A. Lynch, Esq.,

DEAR SIR: In your address made to the voters of this district on the — May last, you charged Van Buren with being opposed to “universal suffrage, in favor of property qualifications, free negro voting, taking the election of the sheriff out of the hands of the people.” The friends of Van Buren have come forward with a flat and positive denial of the whole matter.

If your leisure would admit of it, we should be pleased if you would give to the public the charges and the proof, without which, we are well assured, those charges would never have been made. We feel satisfied that the people will do right if they have but the proper lights to guide them. “Truth is mighty and will prevail.”

We are, very respectfully, yours,

JACOB BAER,
THOMAS SPRINGER,
ADAM KELLER.
JOHN YOUNG,
WILLIAM ERVINE,
JOHN KEAFAUVER, of G.

*To William Ervine, John Young, Adam Keller, Jacob Baer, Thomas Springer,
and John Keafauver, of G.*

GENTLEMEN: You are accurate in your recollection of the grave character of the charges I made against Mr. Van Buren, and you do me mere justice by your confident belief that I would make no charge against a political adversary, which I did not conscientiously believe, or which I was not prepared most conclusively to prove. The noblest and most priceless prerogative of a freeman is the RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE. The most odious restriction which could be imposed upon that proud right would be a PROPERTY QUALIFICATION. To allow FREE NEGROES TO VOTE, and to mingle upon terms of equality with the free white man in the discharge of this high function at the polls, would be considered an outrage upon public feeling. To take away from the great body of the people the ELECTION OF THEIR OWN SHERIFF, and to empower the Executive to appoint him, would be considered anti-republican, unjust and oppressive.

Nevertheless, with a full sense of the grave character of the charges I have heretofore made, and now repeat, I do charge Martin Van Buren, who is for the second time, a candidate for the highest dignity in your gift,

1st. With having moved and voted for taking away the ELECTION OF SHERIFFS FROM THE PEOPLE, and appointing them by the GOVERNOR AND SENATE.

2dly. I charge him with having been in favor of a FREE NEGRO VOTING, who had the PROPERTY QUALIFICATION, and against the POOR WHITE MAN'S VOTING, even if he were a REVOLUTIONARY SOLDIER who had grown poor in fighting for our beloved country !!!

3dly. I charge him with having been opposed to UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, and with having proclaimed in full convention, that "UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE (or allowing the POOR MAN TO VOTE,) WOULD DRIVE ALL SOBER MINDED PEOPLE FROM THE POLLS, AND RENDER OUR ELECTION RATHER A CURSE THAN A BLESSING!!!"

4thly. I charge him with having been in favor of a PROPERTY QUALIFICATION IN VOTERS, and that he *spoke* for it, *voted* for it, and lamented that by extending the right of suffrage, "WE WERE CHEAPENING THIS INVALUABLE PRIVILEGE!!!"

And finally, without making it the ground of a specific charge, I will expose the nature of his peculiar friendship for the Irish, German, and native poor, whom he includes in the sweeping denomination of the "worst population of the cities," whose admission to the right of suffrage, he bitterly complains, would extend the vote of the city of New York from thirteen to twenty-five thousand votes, the *character of which votes* would render our ELECTIONS A CURSE RATHER THAN A BLESSING!! and drive all SOBER MINDED PEOPLE FROM THE POLLS!!

Let the inventors of the *Green or Emerald Sashes* of the 8th of June see that they meet this latter charge fairly, and answer it fully and conclusively, or the harps of Erin will resound with the People rather than with the Rulers upon the Ides of November.

Gentlemen, I feel that if I establish these charges, or any one of them, you will admit, that the man, who does now, or has heretofore entertained such anti-republican opinions unworthy of your suffrages. The documentary evidence which I offer is the "Report of the Proceedings and Debates of the Convention of 1821, assembled for the purpose of amending the Constitution of the State of New York, containing all the official documents relating to the subject, by Nathaniel H. Carter and Wm. L. Stone, Reporters to the Convention."

These Reports were published in Albany in the year 1821, immediately after the adjournment of the Convention, nearly twenty years ago, and long before Mr. Van Buren was spoken of for the Presidency. For nearly twenty years they have been a portion of the political history of our country, and all decent men of all parties will admit their authenticity and correctness. I speak then from the document, and my proof is *Mr. Van Buren's own votes and speeches in full Convention*. Let us begin with the first charge, which is, that Mr. Van Buren *moved* and *voted* for taking away the ELECTION OF SHERIFF from the PEOPLE, and appointing them by the GOVERNOR AND SENATE.

Proof. Turn to page 644 of the Reports of the Convention, and you will find the following proceedings:

Sec. 8. Respecting the ELECTION OF SHERIFFS AND COUNTY CLERKS BY THE PEOPLE, was read.

"Mr. Wheeler moved to amend the section by inserting after the word 'Sheriffs,' the words, 'shall be appointed in the same manner as justices of the peace are directed to be appointed or chosen.'

"Mr. Van Buren *wished the gentleman would modify his motion so as to make the SHERIFFS APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR AND SENATE!!!*

"Mr. Wheeler assented to the modification."

The ayes and noes were then taken upon the motion of Mr. Wheeler, as amended by Mr. Van Buren, and decided in the negative by a vote of 68 to 34.

Thus I have sustained the first charge, namely, that Mr. Van Buren "*moved* and *voted* for taking away the election of Sheriffs by the People, and appointing them by the Governor and Senate." He was in a minority, however, and the People of New York retained the privilege of electing their own Sheriff, notwithstanding Mr. Van Buren's effort to deprive them of it.

We will now proceed to the second charge, which is: "That he was in favor of a FREE NEGRO voting, who had a *property qualification*, and against the *poor White Man's voting*, even if he were a *Revolutionary Soldier*, who had grown poor in fighting for his country."

PROOF—By the old Constitution of New York, as it stood previous to the year 1821,

there was a property qualification required. Every voter must have actually paid taxes, and have been a free holder to the value of *twenty pounds*, or the holder of a lease of the annual value of *forty shillings*.

This property qualification became as odious in the State of New York, as the old "THIRTY POUND LAW" used to be in Maryland. To remedy this evil, and to extend the right of suffrage to all who bore the burdens of the State, whether rich or poor, the people of New York assembled in Convention in the year 1821, and appointed a committee to prepare a report regulating the right of suffrage in conformity with the wishes of the community. I will refer you to page 134 of the Reports of the Proceedings of this Convention for the rule reported by the committee, which extended the right of voting to "every *white* male citizen, resident and of age, who should, within one year preceding the election, have paid any tax, or should have been assessed to work on the highway, or who did actually work, or paid an equivalent in money, or who should have been enrolled and have served in the militia in the State."

In this clause, you will observe that there was still a qualification required, either of *property* or *public service*: and by the words "every *white* male citizen," *free negroes* were deprived of a right to vote. By reference to page 190 of the same document we find that Mr. Jay moved to strike out the word "white" from this clause of the report, the effect of which would be, if carried, to allow free negroes to vote, and to place them on a level with the white men at the polls. Upon this motion a warm debate ensued. Some contended in behalf of the free negro, that all men were by nature free and equal, that negroes had been allowed to vote in New York and other States, and that it would be unjust to deprive them of their inherent rights, &c. Others affirmed (see p 190, 191) "that it would be time to raise the negro to a level with the white man and allow him to vote, when the people should be prepared to blot out all distinction of color, to invite negroes to their tables, to sit in their pews at church, to ride with them in their coaches, to intermarry with their daughters, &c. &c. Colonel Young said that "no white man will stand shoulder to shoulder, with a negro at the musters or in the jury box, that they could not appreciate the value of a vote, it would be at the call of the richest purchaser. Look at your jails and penitentiaries. By whom are they filled? By the very race whom it is now proposed to clothe with the power of deciding upon your political rights. If all are to vote, why not admit *negresses* as well as *negroes* to the right of suffrage? Minors, too, and aliens must no longer be excluded, but the "era of good feelings commenced in earnest." Upon reference to page 202, it will be perceived that the vote was taken on Mr. Jay's motion to strike out the word "white," and thus allow free negroes to vote, which was carried by a vote of 63 to 59, Mr. *Van Buren* voting in the affirmative. As soon as the vote was announced, Gen. Root arose and observed, "that the right of suffrage was now extended to negroes, or, in the polite language of the day to *colored people*, it was inexpedient to admit *strolling voters*."

As the law stood after this vote of Mr. Van Buren, negroes, who had the qualification required by the original report were allowed to vote, but poor white men, who had no property, or had not paid a tax, or served in the militia, or worked on the highway were excluded. Thus I have proved the first part of my charge, to wit: that Mr. Van Buren was in favor of a "free negro voting who had the property qualification."

It remains for me to show the remainder of the proposition, to wit, that he was "against the POOR WHITE MAN'S VOTING, even if he were a REVOLUTIONARY SOLDIER, who had grown poor in fighting for our beloved country."

This is a strong charge, and ought to be clearly proved.

On page 275, of the same reports, we find that General Tallmadge moved to strike out the words "or on the high ways," the effect of which would be to deprive of the right of suffrage a large class of "poor white men."

"Mr. Van Buren supported the motion for striking out. The people, he said were not prepared for UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE!" "Mr. Russell was against striking out. It would disfranchise many who ought to vote. He recollected a REVOLUTIONARY SOLDIER, (one like your own sergeant Everheart,) who was at the siege of Quebec, and another who was at the storming of Stony Point, and neither would have a vote if this motion prevailed." Observe, gentlemen, that Mr. Van Buren, this "friend of the poor man," this "Northern man with Southern principles," had already voted to allow "free negroes" the right of suffrage who had the qualification required by this law, and he was now appealed to by Mr. Russell to permit "revolutionary soldiers" to vote, who had grown poorer than the "free negro" in

fighting the battles of your country. What was his reply? Hear him! Hear his own speech! Out of his own mouth judge ye him, I invite your attention to this speech particularly, because it not only proves his preference of the "moneyed free negro" to the "poor soldier of the Revolution," but it also proves, in connexion with another speech of his, which I will presently refer to, my third and fourth charges, to wit, that he was opposed to universal suffrage, that he complained that by extending the right of suffrage, we were cheapening this invaluable privilege, that he was in favor of a property qualification, and that he proclaimed in full convention, that universal suffrage (or allowing the poor man to vote,) would drive all sober minded people from the polls, and render our elections rather a curse than a blessing!

The first speech of Mr. Van Buren is from page 277 of the reports of proceedings so often quoted. I would ask you, gentlemen, to weigh every word of this speech as I shall transcribe it faithfully from the record.

"Mr. Van Buren said he felt himself called on to make a few remarks in reply to the gentleman from Delaware. He observed that it was evident, and indeed some gentlemen did not seem disposed to disguise it, that the amendment proposed, contemplated nothing short of universal suffrage.

Mr. V. B. did not believe that there were twenty members of that committee, who, were the bare naked question of universal suffrage put to them, would vote in its favor, and he was very sure its adoption was not expected, and would not meet the views of their constituents. Mr. V. B. then replied to a statement made yesterday by Mr. Russell, in relation to the exclusion of "soldiers who had fought at Quebec and Stony Point, under the banners of Montgomery and Wayne." And he felt the necessity of doing this, because such cases, urged by such gentlemen, as his honorable friend, were calculated to make a deep and lasting impression.

With reference to the case of our soldiers, the people of this State and country had certainly redeemed themselves from the imputation that republics are ungrateful.— With an honorable liberality they had bestowed the military lands upon them, and to gladden the evening of their days, had provided them with pensions. Few of those patriots were now living, and of that few the number was yearly diminishing. In fifteen years the grave will have covered all who now survive. Mr. Van Buren continued: was it not unwise to hazard a wholesome *restrictive* provision, lest in its operations it might affect these few individuals for a very short time? One word on the main question before the committee. ¶ We have already reached the verge of universal suffrage. ¶ There was but one step beyond. And are gentlemen prepared to take that step? ¶ We are "**CHEAPENING THIS INVALUABLE RIGHT!!**" ¶ He was disposed to go as far as any man in the extension of rational liberty; but he could not consent ¶ **TO UNDERVALUE THIS PRECIOUS PRIVILEGE** ¶ so far as to confer it with an indiscriminating hand upon every one, *black or white*, who would be kind enough to condescend to accept it!!" And yet, gentlemen, he had already voted to give the right of suffrage to the *qualified black* and deny it to the *Poor white man*. Read over this speech again and again, read it to your sons, and to your neighbors, and tell me if I have left any charge unproved. "Here is *Abolitionism and Property qualification*," with a vengeance, avowed by the man himself in full Convention. But I have not yet done. There remains to be proved another branch of my charges, to wit: that Mr. Van Buren declared that "**UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE** (or allowing the **POOR WHITE MAN TO VOTE**,) would **DRIVE ALL SOBER MINDED PEOPLE FROM THE POLLS, AND RENDER OUR ELECTIONS RATHER A CURSE THAN A BLESSING!!!**" The speech of Mr. Van Buren from which I am now about to quote, will not only prove this part of the charge, but that he was also in favor of requiring of those persons who worked upon the public highways "the further qualification of being **HOUSE-HOLDERS**," a property qualification almost as odious to the people of Maryland as the old English **FREEHOLD SYSTEM**. The attention of the German, Irish and native Poor man will be especially directed to that portion of his speech in which he speaks of the *character* of the votes which would swell the vote of the city of New York from thirteen to twenty-five thousand votes, and which would "surrender the additional representation under the new constitution to the *worst population* of the old countries and cities." The speech to which the critical attention of the public of all parties is respectfully invited, will be found on pages 366-367 of the reports of the Convention.

"Mr. Van Buren said that as the vote he should now give on what was called the

highway qualification, would be different from what it had been on a former occasion, he felt it a duty to make a brief explanation of the motives which governed him. The qualifications required by the first committee were of three kinds, viz: the payment of a money tax, the performance of military duty, and working on the highway. The two former had not met his decided approbation; to the latter (that is a working on the highway) he wished to add the additional (property) qualification, that the voter should, if he paid no tax, performed no military duty, but offered his vote on the sole ground that he had labored on the highways, *also be a House-holder!!* and that was the only point on which he had dissented from the report of the committee. ¶ To effect this object, he supported a motion, made by a gentleman from Dutchess, to strike out the highway qualification, with a view of adding *House-holder.* ¶ That motion, after full discussion, had prevailed by a majority of twenty. But what was the consequence? The very next day, the same gentleman who thought the highway tax too liberal a qualification, voted that every person of twenty-one years of age, having a certain term of residence, and excluding actual paupers, should be permitted to vote for any office in the Government, from the highest to the lowest, far outvieing, in this particular, the other States in the Union, and verging from the extreme of restricted to that of universal suffrage. The Convention, sensible of the very great stride which had been taken by the last vote, the next morning referred the whole matter to a select committee of thirteen, whose report was now under consideration.—That committee, though composed of gentlemen, a large majority of whom had voted for *universal suffrage*, had now recommended a middle course, viz: the payment of a money tax, or labor on the highway, excluding militia service which had, however, been very properly re-instated. The question then recurred, shall an attempt be made again to add that of *HOUSEHOLDER* to the *HIGHWAY* qualification; and run the hazard of the re-introduction of the proposition of the gentleman from Washington, *ABANDONING ALL QUALIFICATIONS, AND THROWING OPEN THE BALLOT BOXES TO EVERY BODY*—¶ demolishing, at one blow, the *distinctive* character of an elector, the proudest and most invaluable attribute of freemen.” ¶

And yet, gentlemen, Martin Van Buren, as you have already seen, voted to bestow this “distinctive character,” this “proud and invaluable attribute of a free man,” upon the *QUALIFIED FREE NEGRO*, and denied it to the *Poor White Soldier who had fought the battles of the Revolution*. Mr. Van Buren continued, and said, that he had, on motion of the gentleman from Columbia, this day hinted at the numerous objections which he had to the proposition, which the other day passed the Convention, in regard to the right of suffrage; objections which he intended to make had the committee reported in favor of that vote, and by which, when fully urged, he knew that he would be able to convince every member of this committee of the *dangerous and alarming tendency of that precipitate and unexpected prostration of all qualifications*. At this moment he would only say, that among the many evils which could flow from a wholly unrestricted suffrage, ¶ the following would be the most injurious, viz: It would give to the city of New York about twenty-five thousand votes, whilst under the liberal extension of the right in the choice of delegates to this Convention, she had but about thirteen or fourteen thousand. That the character of the increased number of votes would be *such as would render their elections rather a curse than a blessing—which would drive from the polls all sober-minded people.* ¶ What, think you, gentlemen, is this terrible scourge, which is to render your elections a curse instead of a blessing, and drive from the polls all sober-minded people? Why, in his own words just quoted, it is “unrestricted or universal suffrage, and the prostration of qualification for voters!” But it is not universal suffrage in itself, it is, in his own language, the “character of the increased number of votes which would swell the city vote of New York from thirteen to twenty-five thousand, that would render our elections a curse instead of a blessing. To whom does he refer? who would thus swell the vote? not the *FREE NEGROES*, for he has already admitted them to the rights of citizenship and suffrage. Who, then, is it? It is the poor white man, whether he be a German, Irish, or Native; for it is against the poor white man, from the Revolutionary soldier down to the most destitute, that he has directed all his talents, all his votes, and all his speeches, from the very moment after he had bestowed the right of suffrage upon the free negro. On page 363 Mr. Van Buren adds, the direct consequence of which (i. e. universal suffrage) would be that the additional representation of fourteen members, which are next year to be distributed among the counties, would

instead of going principally to the West, be ~~de~~surrendered to the worst population of the old countries and cities!! ~~Whom~~ Whom does he mean by the worst population of the cities? Not his favored free negro, not the qualified voter. Whom then? Why the poor white man.

I will quote a few remarks more from the same speech, on page 363 to show that Mr. Van Buren, *while* dealing out the rights of suffrage with such a niggardly hand to the Poor White Man, surrounding it with every possible restriction, is practising a species of deception by looking around for the ways and means of cutting off a large portion of the poorer classes of voters by some future act of the Legislature. He consented, after a sturdy and protracted opposition, to abandon his favorite qualification of "house-holder," and to permit those who worked upon the "highway" to vote. But it was not until he had discovered, that by the multiplication of turnpikes and canals, there would be fewer persons assessed to work upon the "highway," and that "the legislature might at any time afterwards confine the highway tax to property, instead of imposing it, as was then done, upon adult male citizens." But let the speech speak for itself. In enumerating the many evils which would flow from universal suffrage, Mr. Van Buren said: "And, thirdly. The door would have been entirely closed against retreat, whatever might be our after convictions, founded on experience, as to the evil tendency of this extended suffrage. The just equilibrium between the rights of those who have, and those who have no interest in the Government, could, when once thus surrendered, never be regained except by the SWORD. But according to the present report, if experience should point out dangers from the very extensive qualifications we were about to establish, the legislature might relieve against the evil by curtailing the objects of taxation. By the establishment of turnpikes, the making of canals, and the general improvements of the country, the highway tax would naturally be lessened, and might, if the legislature thought proper, be hereafter confined to PROPERTY, instead of imposing it, as they do now, on adult male citizens. For one hundred years at least, this would afford a sufficient protection against the evils which were apprehended. He would, therefore, notwithstanding his desire to have the qualification of HOUSE-HOLDER added to the electors of the third description remain unchanged, accept the report of the committee as it was, with the addition of the military qualification, which he thought ought to be adopted, for the sake of principle, if for no other reason."

You will have observed, gentlemen, that the great struggle in this convention between the friends and the foes of universal suffrage was upon the "highway qualification," or allowing every man to vote who worked upon the highway. Now, as in the State of New York, "every adult male citizen" is assessed to work on the public highway, this qualification amounted in fact to UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE. Hence Mr. Van Buren's deadly hostility to the "highway qualification," and his vehement speeches already quoted, enumerating the many evils of UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, which, in his opinion, would drive all "sober minded people from the polls," and occasion an increase of voters, whose *character* would render our elections a CURSE instead of a BLESSING. How then do the facts appear? Why, *first*, Mr. Van Buren unhesitatingly permits *free negroes* to vote—*secondly*, he forbids the *poor white man* to vote—and *thirdly*, he denounces *universal suffrage* as a *curse* rather than a *blessing*!!!

I think, gentlemen, I have clearly established all I have preferred against Mr. Van Buren.

1st. That he voted for taking away the election of SHERIFFS FROM THE PEOPLE, and appointing them by the GOVERNOR and SENATE.

2d. That he was in favor of FREE NEGROES VOTING who had a property qualification, and against giving a vote to a POOR WHITE MAN, EVEN IF HE WAS A REVOLUTIONARY SOLDIER, AND HAD GROWN OLD IN FIGHTING OUR BATTLES.

3d. That he was in favor of PROPERTY QUALIFICATION VOTERS. And

4th. That he was opposed to UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, and proclaimed that it would "DRIVE ALL SOBER-MINDED PEOPLE FROM THE POLLS," and "RENDER OUR ELECTIONS RATHER A CURSE THAN A BLESSING"!!!

One more remark in relation to the FREE NEGROES, and I am done with this disgusting topic, for I am sure you agree with Gen. Root, "who hoped (it being dinner time) that the Convention would not take up the negroes on an empty stomach!" Mr. Van Buren gave them, as you have seen, the right of suffrage upon the very light qualification already mentioned, of "paying a tax," or *working on the highway*; but the Convention subsequently required of them to be freeholders to the amount of \$250 clear

of debt and incumbrance, three years residence, and payment of taxes. [See page 661.]

I believe with you, gentlemen, that a large portion of the Van Buren party, many of whom are among the most estimable of my friends; are sincerely desirous of learning the whole truth in relation to these charges against Mr. Van Buren; and I furthermore unhesitatingly declare my opinion, that no man in the State of Maryland, other than the office-holders, who is convinced of any one of these charges, will support him for any office.

The Standing Army of two hundred thousand men in a time of profound peace.

The startling increase of the expenditures of the Federal Government, profusely pouring forth millions of the People's money, until the term *millions of dollars* has become as familiar as household words. The *Currency Bill* of the last session, than which the very genius of madness and folly could not have devised a scheme more speedily, widely and eminently destructive to the best interests of the State of Maryland; all these questions agitate the People. But far above them all arises the *poor man's proudest privilege, the RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE!!* The right of suffrage is the key of freedom. It is the fundamental principle of free governments—it is the cardinal virtue of the Constitution,—it is the KEY STONE of the ARCH OF DEMOCRACY. And it is against this key stone of the arch, UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, THE POOR MAN'S LAST PRIVILEGE AND ONLY DEFENCE, that in the year 1821, Mr. Van Buren directed all the powers of his understanding, and wielded the whole force of his influence. Listen not to the miserable plea that since 1821 he has declared himself in favor of universal suffrage; for I have spread before you the evidence of his opinions upon this subject *deliberately formed and strongly enforced*. As to any subsequent declarations he may have found it necessary to make to smooth the path of preferment, they will not weigh a feather with a jealous and reflecting people. Hearken not to the wretched apology that the federalists in the New York Convention urged *universal suffrage*, in order that the new Constitution might be rejected by the people when submitted to them for their approval. For, in the first place no free people is apt to reject a constitution on account of the beautiful feature of universal suffrage, this apology itself being a repetition of Mr. Van Buren's slander upon the People of New York, that "*they are not prepared for universal suffrage*." And, secondly, let the views of the federalists have been what they pleased, Mr. Van Buren stands convicted out of his own mouth, for in his speeches as you have already seen, he speaks of the *thing itself in the abstract*; he speaks of *universal suffrage*, and in enumerating the many evils that would result from it, he denounces it as calculated TO DRIVE ALL SOBER-MINDED MEN FROM THE POLLS, and to RENDER OUR ELECTIONS RATHER A CURSE THAN A BLESSING!! We have universal suffrage in Maryland: the poor man's vote tells as strongly as his rich neighbors. Let me then ask whether universal suffrage, or allowing the poor man to vote, is considered a curse rather than a blessing in old Maryland? I wish to hear the answer through the ballot-box.

I urged these charges against Mr. Van Buren, as you well know, gentlemen, in 1836; but we were then in the whirl of a revolution, in the midst of confusion and anarchy, occasioned by the faithlessness of the nineteen Van Buren Electors, and the whole energies of our people were exerted to crush this unnatural rebellion against the constituted authorities of the State. But, at this time, notwithstanding the solicitude of our adversaries to avoid these charges, I confidently predict that they will be the prominent topic of discussion. Their own party will demand, not merely a defence of Mr. Van Buren, but a full, convincing and conclusive vindication. The question cannot be dodged; neither, in my humble judgment, can it be met successfully. I have had the journal of debates and proceedings in the New York Convention in my possession for many years; I have searched them faithfully and diligently; and so firm is my conviction of the truth of these charges, that I am sure that the whole power of the Federal Executive press, the great Globe itself, with all its EXTRAS, backed with all the wisdom of the SERPENT at its head, who stung his benefactor, cannot explain or refute them. Because, in your own words, gentlemen,—truth is mighty and will prevail. And when you superadd to Mr. Van Buren's vote allowing NEGROES TO VOTE, the fact that he was for the ABOLITION OF SLAVERY in the State of Missouri, and the further fact that he permitted Lieut. Hooe, of the Navy, to be tried and condemned by a court martial on the testimony of TWO NEGROES, who were the servants of his accuser, we may well question the merits of this "NORTHERN man with SOUTHERN principles."

In conclusion, gentlemen, let me remind you, that upon the eve of the last Presidential election, in 1836, there was a desperate effort made by the nineteen Van Buren electors, by the agency of a revolution under pretence of reform, to bow down the good old State of Maryland before the footstool of the Federal Executive. And now, in 1840, upon the approach of another Presidential election, your Senate has defeated a similar scheme, for a similar purpose, and almost as destructive as the former. I allude to the CURRENCY BILL of the last session, as one of the measures of a stupendous scheme of ruin, designed by the Federal Executive, and supported by his adherents in the several States of this Union, to overthrow your State banks; to destroy the credit system; to crush your people, and to remove all obstacles to the full sweep of the "Sub-Treasury System,"* a bill to establish which is about to be forced upon the People by their rulers, after we have three times rejected it. The revolution of 1836, and the Currency Bill of 1840, are measures of the same party, equally destructive, designed for the same purpose, and each on the eve of a Presidential election. You rebuked the nineteen, and crushed the revolution of 1836.

Has your arm been shortened?

Very respectfully, gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

EDWARD A. LYNCH.

* The Sub-Treasury bill has since been passed.